

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/988,783	Applicant(s) PREVOST, JEAN	
	Examiner Wendy Boss	Art Unit 1775	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Wendy Boss. (3) Robert Mitchell.
 (2) Matt Shanley. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 26 June 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: samples of turf including infill and without any infill.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-28.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prevost, Tomarin, Rutherford, Haas.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding 112, first paragraph rejection of claim 28, applicant's counsel points to paragraph 51 for support of use as crop material. Regarding 112, 2nd paragraph, applicant's counsel points to page 13, which includes discussion of such a relationship. With regard to the 102 rejection over the Prevost reference, applicant's counsel proposes amending claim 1 to include limitation of particulate material having thickness of substantially $\frac{2}{3}$ the length of the ribbons. Applicant's counsel argues that reference does not include relationship of all three (infill thickness, length of ribbons, and row spacing) parameters. Regarding 102 rejection over the Tomarin reference, applicant's counsel argues that the reference does not provide for the relationship recited in claim 13. With regard to the Rutherford reference, counsel argues that the reference does not anticipate use in turf. The benefits of such use was not previously known.